

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, continued to reject all pending claims 1-4, 8-20, and 23-32. In response, Applicant submits the following remarks. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Summary of Telephone Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Andrews for time spent with Applicant's representative, Thomas Hildebrandt, Reg. No. 59,303, during a telephone interview conducted on January 12, 2010, regarding the above-identified Office Action. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) was discussed. Several arguments were presented. No agreement was reached, but the Examiner indicated that the arguments would be further considered when included in a written response to the Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 8-13, 15-20, 23-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell Labs Technical Journal et al, in view of Shaheen (US 2007/0211683 A1) and Mayer (US 2005/0015499 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for at least the following reasons. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the

claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. See, e.g., *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A triggering method for IP multimedia service control, comprising the steps of:
a first User Equipment (UE) initializing a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message;
a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) recording the SIP request message and forwarding the SIP request message to a second UE without checking any initial Filter Criteria and going through an application server;
the S-CSCF receiving a SIP response message initialized by the second UE associated to the SIP request message;
the S-CSCF examining the SIP response message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC) defining a set of Service Point Triggers (SPTs), comprising specific SIP responses triggering individual application services available from a service provider; and
re-issuing the SIP request message to the application server designated by the rFC if the SIP response message matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC; wherein the SIP response message is a final response-initialized by the second UE.

(*Emphasis added*). Independent claim 17 recites:

17. An Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia subsystem, comprising:
one or more application servers each designated by a response Filter Criteria (rFC), wherein the rFC defines a set of Service Point Triggers (SPTs) to provide a service in response to SIP response messages; and
a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF), forwarding a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message initialized by a first User Equipment (UE) to a second UE without checking any initial Filter Criteria and going through an application server, receiving a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) response message initialized by the second UE associated to the SIP request message, **examining the SIP response message by a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)**, and re-issuing the SIP request message to the application server when a Service Point Trigger (SPT) in a rFC that designates to the application server is matched by the SIP response message; wherein the SIP response message is a final response initialized by the second UE.

(*Emphasis added*). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to show or suggest at least the features emphasized above in claims 1 and 17.

The Office Action (p. 3) alleges that Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses “examining the SIP response message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)” at page 32, col. 2, lines 12-15. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Page 32, col. 2, lines 12-15 of Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses that “[t]he request that is the output of the first application server is subjected to the next highest priority filter criteria.” Applicant emphasizes that **the request** is examined according to the highest priority of the filter criteria. However, claims 1 and 17 recite “examining the **SIP response message** according to **a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)**”.

Firstly, Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses examining **the request** instead of examining the **SIP response message** recited in the claims 1 and 17. Applicant believes that the SIP response message is different from the request. For example, even if a request message is received, a SIP response message may not be obtained in response to the request message. Thus, analogizing the request message with the SIP response message is unreasonable.

In the telephone interview conducted on January 12, 2010, the Examiner pointed to page 33, col. 1, lines 1-5 of Bell Labs Technical Journal, which states: “This process continues until all the different priorities of filter criteria are considered or until the service logic performed in one of the application servers results in a final response to the SIP request”. Applicant submits that the page 33, col. 1, lines 1-5 of Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses that the process ends when the application servers receive a final response to the SIP request. Bell Labs Technical Journal only discloses a

response, but Bell Labs Technical Journal never teaches “examining the **SIP response message** according to **a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)**”. Therefore, Bell Labs Technical Journal does not teach or suggest “examining the SIP response message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)”.

In addition, the page 32, col. 1, lines 39-41 of Bell Labs Technical Journal discloses that “[t]he filtering is done on **SIP request messages** such as REGISTER, INVITE, SUBSCRIBE, or BYE, **but not on responses to requests.**” Bell Labs Technical Journal appears to disclose only that the filtering is done **on SIP request messages** but not on responses. Furthermore, page 32, col. 2, lines 5-9 of Bell Labs Technical Journal states: “When a **SIP request** for a dialog comes in, the highest priority filter criteria are considered by the S-CSCF first, and, if **the SIP request** is selected by the criteria, it is passed as is on to the application server corresponding to the highest priority filter criteria.” (*Emphasis added*). Bell Labs Technical Journal appears to disclose filtering **based on the SIP request** instead of **the SIP response** recited in claims 1 and 17. Therefore, Bell Labs Technical Journal does not disclose “examining the SIP **response** message according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC)” in claims 1 and 17. Moreover, by affirmatively stating that filtering is not done on responses to requests, Bell Labs Technical Journal explicitly **teaches away** from the claimed features.

Furthermore, Applicant provides herewith a proposal entitled, “An enhanced mechanism for Application Servers invocation in a SIP-based network” from the 10th International Conference on Intelligence in Next Generation Networks, 2006. Page 2, paragraphs 2-5 in this proposal discusses the 3GPP, TS23.218 standard, which is the

same as disclosed by Bell Labs Technical Journal. This proposal discloses that, in 3GPP, TS23.218 standard, when the S-CSCF invokes a given service upon receiving a SIP request matching the corresponding iFC, it forwards this SIP request to the AS indicated in this iFC. (See, page 2, col.1 , lines 9-15). Therefore, this proposal also emphasizes filtering based on the SIP request as in 3GPP, TS23.218 standard instead of the SIP response.

Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Shaheen and Mayer fail to cure the deficiencies of Bell Labs Technical Journal as discussed above. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1 and 16 be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-4, 8-13, 15-16, 18-20, 23-29 and 31-32 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 14 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bell Labs Technical Journal in view of Mayer, Shaheen, and Khartabil (US 2005/0154793). Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of Mayer, Shaheen, and Khartabil fails to cure the deficiencies of Bell Labs Technical Journal as discussed above in connection with the rejections of claims 1 and 17. Accordingly, dependent claims 14 and 30 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Should the Examiner believe that a teleconference would be helpful to expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

A credit card authorization is provided herewith to cover the fees associated with the accompanying petition for extension of time. No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

By:

Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
600 Galleria Pkwy, SE
Suite 1500
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500